

HPA Attributes Poll

NOTE: This poll closes on Thu March 8th, 2018



One vote per company

HPA is a desired feature to be supported in R2, but no agreements have been reached on the attributes to be included into the clean version. This poll is to decide which (or all) of these attributes are to be included in the clean version (R2 IM).

Attributes include (defined in [ETSI IFA011 v2.4.1](#)):

- vduCpuRequirements (attribute of IE/class VirtualCpuData)
- vduMemRequirements (attribute of IE/class VirtualMemoryData)
- vduStorageRequirements (attribute of IE/class VirtualStorageDesc)
- logicalNode (attribute of IE/class VirtualComputeDesc)
- nicloRequirements (attribute of IE/data type VirtualNetworkInterfaceRequirements)
- networkInterfaceRequirements (attribute of IE/data type VirtualNetworkInterfaceRequirements)

Examples of the above attributes can be found at <https://wiki.onap.org/pages/viewpageattachments.action?pageId=24051740&metadataLink=true>, or if you have ETSI account, NFVIFA(18)000162 contribution.

Poll Question

Which (or all) of the attributes you would like to include in R2 IM?

Option 1: include this attribute in the clean version (same as IFA011)

Option 2: include this attribute in the clean version and remove other redundant (legacy) attributes (modification based on IFA011)

Option 3: not include this attribute in the clean version

Please put your @name in one of the option column for each attribute (or the "ALL" for simplicity) and provide any comments you might have.

Attribute	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Comments
"ALL"	Andy Mayer Amir Levy Andrei Kojukhov Michela Bevilacqua	Xu Yang Lingli Deng Yufei ZHou han yanan Alexander Vul xinhuili Brian Hedstrom Fernando Oliveira		<p>All the listed attributes (for simplicity).</p> <p>Brian Hedstrom: The link provided above for Key-Value Pair Registries.docx, for the HPA Key Value Pairs, is linking to an OLD version of the file. The vduComputeRequirements Registry Example provided in the link above DOES NOT MATCH the vduComputeRequirements Registry Example provided in NFVIFA(18)000162r1. It's not clear to me if we are voting on the attributes only in this attribute table, or also voting on supporting the key value pairs per NFVIFA(18)000162r1. I would suggest the key value pairs be a separate poll/discussion. My vote here is for the attribute table only.</p> <p>Xu Yang: to Brian, the vote is only for the attribute table, not the key value pairs.</p> <p>maopeng zhang:</p> <p>I agree HPA requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All changes for HPA in R2 should not effect R1 VoLTE case. It needs the data model compatible, which the VoLTE case already used. If this can be pre-condition in R2, I agree with add HPA attributes. But how to add, we needs more details. 2. The main purpose of OPT2 is to avoid redundancy parametes. Needs more KVP details and data model definitions to clear the solution benefits. <p>Michela Bevilacqua: updated version of the key value pairs registry to be supported in R2 and identification of deprecated (legacy) attributes to be finalised.</p> <p>Thinh Nguyenphu: With Option 1 or Option 2, there is a way in TOSCA grammar to indicate the status of each TOSCA properties (supported, unsupported, experimental, deprecated). Thus, we can indicate to implementer how some of these duplicate attributes status. Of course Option 2 is possible, it would requires these supporting companies to bring concrete CRs to remove these duplicate attributes, as soon as possible. It is not good practice to remove an attribute(s) once a specification is already published without early notification.</p> <p>Brian Hedstrom I support deprecating or obsoleting the hardcoded legacy attributes in favor of the key-value pairs. I don't think they should be deleted from the DM in order to support backward compatibility (and make them optional), but they should be deprecated or obsoleted so they are not used going forward.</p>
vduCpuRequirements				<p>Xu Yang: Possible redundant attributes: numVirtualCpu, virtualCpuClock, logicalCpuPinningPolicy, logicalCpuThreadPinningPolicy</p> <p>Alexander Vul: the computeRequirements attribute is not HPA related.</p> <p>Xu Yang: remove computeRequirements</p> <p>Alexander Vul: These are not redundant. If I remember right, they are complementary...</p>
vduMemRequirements				
vduStorageRequirements				
logicalNode				<p>Xu Yang: Question: In the example document, the logical node requirements are categorized into compute, memory and network categories. But in IFA011, only one logicalNode attribute is defined, what's the mapping here?</p> <p>Alexander Vul: There is a single k/v array holding attributes from three registries... We will optimize this, when registries are created.</p> <p>Brian Hedstrom Is logicalNode and logicalNodeDescr the same attribute? I'm finding both in the Wiki. logicalNode is not listed as an attribute for Class: VirtualComputeDesc</p>
nicloRequirements				<p>Xu Yang: Question: related to the above comment, if the network logical node requirements are specific, should this be a dedicated data type instead of a reference?</p> <p>Alexander Vul: Hmm... Need to think about it. As I review both the NFV Profile based spec and the SOL spec, I am finding some oddities.. We may have a mistake or two in how things got modeled..</p> <p>Brian Hedstrom nicloRequirements is not listed as an attribute (or data type for other attribute) for Class: VirtualNetworkInterfaceRequirements</p>
networkInterfaceRequirements				
logicalNodeData				<p>Brian Hedstrom This appears to be a Class, not an attribute.</p>

redundant